



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## RECENT LITERATURE.

MISSION SCIENTIFIQUE AU MEXIQUE ; RECHERCHES ZOOLOGIQUES ; TROIS. PARTIE, RECH. SUR LES REPTILES ET LES BATRACIENS, par MM. Duméril et Bocourt.—This part of this magnificent work advances well into the Ophidia, which is the only order remaining to be completed to bring the series to a close. Forty-eight species are described, of which thirty-six are figured as to the details of the scutellation of the head and adjacent parts of the body. These figures are nicely executed, and two of them, representing species of *Ninia*, are full length and colored. This work brings the subject of Mexican Ophiology nearer to date than any general work, and includes a number of species of North America and the West Indies. We have not been able in previous numbers to praise the systematic treatment of the subject, and the present number presents rather more numerous defects than any of its predecessors. Thus the species described purport to belong to the group *Calamariinæ*. Nevertheless it is quite certain the serpents like *Ninia* cannot belong to the same natural group as *Catostoma* and *Carphophiops*, the only character they possess in common being their *small size*. I have shown in fact<sup>1</sup> that *Ninia* must be arranged with *Storeria* and *Tropidonotus* on account of the presence of hypapophyses throughout the dorsal vertebral column. As to nomenclature, the failure to adopt the names of Baird and Girard, where they have priority of date of publication over those of Duméril and Bibron, is a serious error. Inconsistencies in nomenclature are observable. Thus *Chersodromus* is adopted, while *Colorhogia*, which rests on the same differential character, is not adopted. The genus *Enulius* is wrongly identified. We now give a corrected nomenclature of the species mentioned in this work :

*Geophis hofmanni* should be *Colobognathus hofmanni* Peters ; *Geophis semidoliatus*, *chalybæus*, *dubius* and *rostralis*, should be *Catostoma* respectively ; and *Geophis rhodogaster* Cope, should be *Colophrys rhodogaster* Cope ; *Carphophis amœna* = *Carphophiops amœna* Say ; *Enulius murinus* should be *Geagras longicaudatus* Cope ; and *E. sumichrasti*, *Geagras sumichrasti* Boc. *Conocephalus* D. & B., is *Haldea* B. & G. ; *Streptophorus* D. & B., is *Ninia* B. & G. ; and *St. sebæ* D. & B., 1854, is *N. atrata* Hallow., 1845. *Lamprosoma* Hallow., was long since changed to *Chionactis* Cope, because pre-occupied ; and *L. episcopum* is *Contia episcopa* ; *Cryptodacus redimitus* is *Colorhogia redimita* Cope. *Conopsis* includes three genera, as I have pointed out. *C. nasus* and *C. maculatus* properly belong to it, while *C. lineatus* is *Toluca lineata* Kenn., on account of the presence of internasals. *C. varians* belongs to the genus *Ogmis* Cope, on account of the presence of grooved teeth.<sup>2</sup> In the same way *Ficimia ornata* is distinct from *Ficimia*

<sup>1</sup> Proceedings Phila. Academy, 1864, p. 167.

<sup>2</sup> See Journal Academy Phila., 1875, p. 142.

in the presence of internasal scuta, and should be referred to the genus *Gyalopium* Cope, of which it is the second species. It was described some years ago<sup>1</sup> as *Ficimia publia* Cope. The *Pseudoficimia pulchra* is the *Geagras frontalis* Cope,<sup>2</sup> the difference from the other species of *Geagras* figured on the same plate, *i. e.*, the separation of the nasal from the preocular by an interspace not being of generic value. *Scolecophis* Fitz., should be *Scolecophis* Cope, who first described the genus. *Homalocranium* D. & B., is *Tantilla* B. & G., of prior date. Here should come the genus *Enulius* Cope, which is truly glyphodont, though the authors of this work assert the contrary. *Ogmis* should also be placed near to *Stenorhina* in the glyphodont series.—*E. D. C.*

CHAMBERLAIN'S GEOLOGY OF WISCONSIN<sup>3</sup>.—This is not only one of our best State reports, but one of the most valuable and interesting. Beginning to look casually over the first part of Vol. I, entitled General Geology, by the chief geologist, we expected to find the usual résumé for popular use, but while it is entertaining, for it held our attention from its able summary of the whole story, it will continue to have permanent value from its discussion of the Archæan age as well as the Glacial epoch. We should unhesitatingly recommend any beginner or advanced student in geology to read this part of Vol. I in connection with his geological manuals.

The candid, well-balanced mind of the chief geologist is seen throughout the entire narrative as well as in the discussions and references to the opinions and works of others. It is evident that the survey has been in good directive hands, while the reports of the assistants prove that the details have been carefully and skillfully elaborated. The people of Wisconsin are to be congratulated on the results of such excellent work, and on having them presented in a simple, intelligible form.

Beginning with the hypothetical and pre-Laurentian history of Wisconsin and of North America in general, which is discussed in a fresh and comprehensive way, we find a good sketch of the Archæan age, which seems to us, in some points, more satisfactory than that given in the text-books. To be sure nearly every point of interest connected with this age is under debate. Professor Chamberlain, however, adopts Selwyn's view that the upper portion of the Laurentian, *i. e.*, those strata bearing the great beds of limestone and iron, as well as graphite, belong in reality to a later or Huronian age. "All the facts thus far disclosed in Wisconsin support this view, which, pending the results of investigations which must yet occupy some years, we shall assume to be

<sup>1</sup> *Proceeds. Phila. Acad.*, 1866, p. 126.

<sup>2</sup> *Loc. cit.*, p. 142; *Toluca frontalis*, *Proceeds. Phila. Acad.*, 1864, p. 167.

<sup>3</sup> *Geology of Wisconsin. Survey of 1873-79. Vols. 1-IV. Atlas of maps. Vols. I, IV, 1882 '3. 8vo.*